



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,784	06/26/2002	Barry J. Gilhuly	1400-1072 PC1	9501
54120 7590 05/14/2010 RESEARCH IN MOTION ATTN: GLENDA WOLFE BUILDING 6, BRAZOS EAST, SUITE 100 5000 RIVERSIDE DRIVE IRVING, TX 75039				
EXAMINER				
MACILWINEN, JOEIN MOORE JAIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2442				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/14/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

portfolioprossecution@rim.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/088,784

Applicant(s)

GILHULY ET AL.

Examiner

John M. MacIwinen

Art Unit

2442

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 63-68, 75-77, 79-81, 83, 86-90, 92 and 120 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 63-68, 75-77, 79-81, 83, 86-90, 92 and 120 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant's argue on page 16, addressing the Beyda reference. Applicant's argue that "Beyda does not disclose or suggest that messages are forwarded to a redirector program via a wide area network".

However, Beyda shows said "redirector program" through the message processor/email server shown in item 20 of Fig. 1. Beyda shows where said redirector program receives a forwarded message via a wide area network by reciting, in col. 2 lines 43 – 47 that the "user stations are ... logically connected to the [redirector program] by a local area network or wide area network such as the internet". Beyda continues in col. 2 lines 50 - 51 by reciting that a user "forwards [their] message to the [redirector program]".

Applicant's arguments thus are not persuasive.

3. Applicant continues by arguing that "Beyda appears to disclosure an email server that receives an email from a sender and sends that email to the addresses, but not to other addresses".

Beyda does teach forwarding as cited. Beyda, Fig. 3, shows forwarding of messages of a WAN, as does col. 2 lines 45 – 48. Additionally, col. 2 lines 46 - 53 describes an "email server"/"message processor" performing forwarding; after it

receives a messages from a user "via a wide area network" said "email server"/"message processor" forwards the message to other destinations.

4. Applicant next argues, continuing on page 16, that "Beyda does not receive a message addressed to a user associated with the messaging system and forward the message to an address that is not listed as the recipient...".

As the Examiner noted above, Beyda was not relied upon for teaching sending a message "to an address that is not listed as the recipient". As the Examiner noted on pages 4 – 5 of the rejection mailed 4/3/2009:

"WyndMail shows where the data message received at the messaging host system is addressed to a first address of the user associated with the messaging host system (pgs. 1 and 4) and

processing the copy of the data message to add a second address that is associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device (pgs. 1, 3, 4)".

5. Applicant next argues on page 17 that "Beyda does not suggest forwarding a message once that message has reached an intended recipient". However, Beyda was not cited for teaching all of these limitations. Regardless, Beyda shows the "email server"/"message processor" 20 in Fig. 1 as an intended recipient that forwards a message it has received (where col. 2 lines 49 – 52 recites that the "email server"/"message processor" routes/forwards messages that has been sent to it by the originator of a message to recipients at other stations).

Applicant's arguments thus continue to be unpersuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 63-68, 76-81, 86, 89-90, and 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motorola AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Version 1.1, hereafter AirMobile, in view of Beyda et al. (US 6,636,965 B1), hereafter Beyda, further in view of WyndMail (WyndMail for Windows CE; 1997) and comp.mail.sendmail ("Need to rewrite From Field on outgoing mail; May 23, 1996), further in view of Selgas (US 6,571,290 B2).

3. Regarding claim 63, AirMobile shows a method of redirecting data messages between a messaging host system (Fig. 1; cc:Mail Post Office Server) and a wireless mobile communication device (Fig. 1, wireless cc:Mail Mobile user), comprising
receiving a data message at the messaging host system for a user, wherein the data message is received from a sender (Fig. 1, Post Office Server receiving data message and storing it in the user's cc:Mail mailbox at The Post-Office server, pages 10-11)

detecting the data message at the messaging host system (Fig. 1, Post-Office Server recognizes the incoming data message from the user once the user has registered with his mailbox with the cc:Mail Post Office Server, pages 10-11);

forwarding a copy of the data message (AirMobile, transferring emails or cc:mails) from the messaging host system (Fig. 1, Post-Office Server) to a wireless redirector host system (Fig. 1, AirMobile Wireless for cc:Mail Server)

determining whether the copy of the data message should be redirected from the wireless redirector host system to the wireless mobile communication device (Fig. 1, pages 10-11, 25-27, 35, determining the routing or downloading or transferring of messages to mobile user from the AirMobile Wireless for cc:Mail Server); and

transmitting the copy of the data message from the wireless redirector host system to the user's wireless mobile communication device (Fig. 1, pages 10-11, 25-27, 35).

AirMobile further shows downloading messages from and uploading messages to the users inbox, but AirMobile does not explicitly show a 1st and a 2nd address. AirMobile additionally shows where the forwarding to the wireless director is via a local area network connection between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system, but does not show where said local area network connection is instead a wide area network connection.

Beyda shows where email servers can be accessed over local area network connections or wide area network connections, include where said email servers are involved in forwarding messages (col. 2 lines 38-63), thus disclosing where the forwarding to the wireless director is via a wide area network connection between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile with that of Beyda in order to encompass a wider variety of messages processing system configurations, thus providing for additional flexibility in implementing the disclosed method/system.

AirMobile in view of Beyda do not show all of where the data message received at the messaging host system is addressed to a first address of the user associated with the messaging host system and processing the copy of the data message to add a second address that is associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device; receiving a reply message from the wireless mobile communication device; and causing the reply message to be transmitted to the sender of the data message wherein the user's first address is configured as the reply message's originating address.

WyndMail shows where the data message received at the messaging host system is addressed to a first address of the user associated with the messaging host system (pgs. 1 and 4) and

processing the copy of the data message to add a second address that is associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device (pgs. 1, 3, 4);

using the second address associated with the wireless mobile communication device via wireless transmission network (pgs. 1, 4);

receiving a reply message from the wireless mobile communication device responsive to the data message (pg. 4); and

causing the reply message to be transmitted to the sender of the data message wherein the user's first address is configured as the reply message's reply-to address (pg. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda with that of WyndMail in order to support additional methods of communication (WyndMail, pg. 1) as well as to better manage how reply messages are handled (WyndMail, pg. 4).

AirMobile in view of Beyda and WyndMail show ensuring the desired reply-to address is used, but do not explicitly show where the originating address is also updated.

comp.mail.sendmail shows updating both the reply-to address and the originating address (that is, the 'from' address – pg. 1 and 2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda and WyndMail with that of comp.mail.sendmail in order to ensure that the user's outgoing reply messages are fully modified to appear to have come from the address the user desires, thus better ensuring the transparent use of multiple email addresses.

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail and comp.mail.sendmail do not explicitly show where said copy of the data message is repackaged in an outer envelope. AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail and comp.mail.sendmail do show receiving a reply message from the wireless mobile communication device (Wynd, pg. 4), but do not explicitly show where the reply message is repackaged in an outer envelope having an address associated with the wireless redirector host system, nor do they show removing said outer envelope of the repackaged reply message at the wireless redirector host system.

Selgas shows a method of transmitting messages, including where messages are repackaged in an outer envelopes, as well as where messages sent by users, such as reply messages, are repackaged in an outer envelope having an address associated with the redirector host system (represented by the 'broker' in Selgas) as well as removing the outer envelope of the repacked reply message at said redirector host system (Selgas, col. 25 line10 – col. 26 line 42, Figs. 10, 11, 13 and 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail and comp.mail.sendmail with that of Selgas, and thus explicitly incorporate message repackaging in said outer envelopes at the wireless message redirector/broker in order to add additional security when transferring messages in the system of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail and comp.mail.sendmail.

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas thus show all of claim 63.

4. Regarding claim 64, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show storing the data message in a first data store associated with the messaging host system (AirMobile, pg. 25).
5. Regarding claim 65, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show wherein the detecting step includes the steps of: determining whether a data message has been received at the messaging host system for a particular user of a wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, page 10); and checking a forwarding file coupled to the messaging host system to determine whether

the particular user's data messages should be forwarded to the wireless redirector host system (AirMobile, page 10).

6. Regarding claim 66, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show wherein the forwarding file includes a list of network addresses associated with the wide area network connection where the user's data messages should be forwarded by the messaging host system (AirMobile, page 10).

7. Regarding claim 67, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show configuring a set of filtering rules for use by the wireless redirector host system in determining whether the data message should be redirected to the user's wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, page 11-12); and providing an access mechanism that allows the user to remotely configure and reconfigure the filtering rules by connecting to the wireless redirector host system from a remote terminal (AirMobile, page 11-12).

8. Regarding claim 68, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show configuring a user profile database for use by the wireless redirector host system in determining whether the data message should be redirected to the user's wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, page 11-12); and providing an access mechanism that allows a system administrator of the messaging host system to remotely configure and reconfigure the user profile database by connecting to the wireless redirector host system from a remote terminal (AirMobile, page 11-12).

9. Regarding claim 76, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show accessing a user profile database including a list of authorized

users (AirMobile, pgs. 14-18); and checking whether the users associated with the data message is an authorized user to determine whether the data message should be redirected to the user's wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, pgs. 15 – 22).

10. Regarding claim 77, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show accessing a filter rules database including a list of filters to be applied to data messages for a particular user (AirMobile, pgs. 11-12) and applying the filters to the data message to determine whether the data message should be redirected to the user's wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, pgs. 35-38).

11. Regarding claim 79, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show where the user's wireless mobile communication device is a laptop computer (AirMobile, Fig.1, pgs. 10 – 11).

12. Regarding claim 80, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show wherein the user's wireless mobile communication device is a two-way paging computer (AirMobile, Fig.1, pgs. 10 – 11).

13. Regarding claim 81, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show where the two-way paging computer includes a wireless network interface for communicating with the wireless redirector host system via the wireless transmission network (AirMobile, Fig.1, pgs. 10 – 11).

14. Regarding claim 86, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show wherein the wide area network connection coupling the messaging host system to the wireless redirector host system is an Internet connection (Beyda, col. 2 lines 38-63).

15. Regarding claim 89, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show configuring a user profile database for use by the wireless redirector host system in determining whether the data message should be redirected to the wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, pgs. 17-18, 35-38) and storing, within the user profile database, second address associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile, pgs. 18-21, WyndMail, pg. 4).

16. Regarding claim 90, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show storing, within the user profile database, information regarding the type and configuration of the wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile pgs. 17-21).

17. Regarding claim 120, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas further show a wireless redirector host system for directing data messages between a messaging host system and a wireless mobile communication device (AirMobile Fig. 1, pgs. 10-11) , the system comprising:

means for receiving a data message via a wide area network connection, wherein the data message is forwarded from the messaging host system for a user (Beyda, col. 2 lines 38-63), the data message originating from a sender and addressed to a first address of the user associated with the messaging host system (AirMobile, Fig. 1, WyndMail, pgs. 1 and 4)

means for processing a copy of the data message to repackage it with an outer envelope (Selgas, col. 25 line 10 – col. 26 line 40) having add a second address that is associated with the user's wireless mobile communication device (WyndMail, pg. 4);

means for redirecting, responsive to determining that the repackaged (Selgas, col. 25 line 10 – col. 26 line 40) copy of the data message should be redirected, the repackaged copy of the data message to the wireless mobile communication device using the second address associated with the wireless mobile communication device via a wireless transmission network (WyndMail, pg. 1, 3 and AirMobile Fig. 1, pages 10-11, 25-27, 35);

means for receiving a reply message that is repackaged in an outer envelope (Selgas, Figs. 10, 13, 14) from the wireless mobile communication device the outer envelope having an address associated with the wireless redirector hosts system (Selgas, col. 25 lines 10 – 16);

and means for removing the outer envelope of the repackaged reply message (Selgas, col. 25 lines 38 – 55, col. 26 lines 25 – 42) and for causing the reply message to be transmitted to the sender of the data message wherein the user's first address is configured as the reply message's originating address (WyndMail, pgs. 1, 3, 4 and comp.mail.sendmail, pgs. 1 – 2).

18. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas as applied to claims 63 above, and further in view of Moon et al. (6,138,146), hereafter Moon.

19. Regarding claim 75, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas show claim 63.

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas do not

show transmitting a deactivation message associated with the user of the wireless mobile communication device to the wireless redirector host system; and upon receiving the deactivation message, prohibiting the redirection of data messages for the user sending the deactivation message.

Moon shows transmitting a deactivation message associated with the user of the wireless mobile communication device to the wireless redirector host system; and upon receiving the deactivation message, prohibiting the redirection of data messages for the user sending the deactivation message (col. 2 lines 61-68, col. 3 lines 1-5, col. 6 lines 27-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas with that of Moon in order to enable better control over which users were able to utilize the mail forwarding system, as well as when they could utilize said system.

20. Claims 83, 87 and 88, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas as applied to claim 63, above, and further in view of Cao et al. (US 6,745,230 B1), hereafter Cao.

21. Regarding claim 83, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas show claim 63, as well as utilizing ISP accounts.

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas do not

explicitly show wherein the messaging host system in an Internet Service Provider.

Cao shows an Internet Service Provider, and also shows where said Internet Service Provider serves as a messaging host system (Abstract, col. 1 lines 20-60, col. 3 lines 5-8, col. 6 lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas with that of Cao in order to support a common email architecture (Cao, col. 1 lines 20-60).

22. Regarding claim 87, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail, Selgas show wherein the access mechanism for remotely configuring and reconfiguring (AirMobile pgs. 35-40) the filtering rules.

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas do not explicitly show a web-page interface.

Cao shows a web-page interface (Cao, col. 4 lines 8-52, col. 5 lines 62-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas with that of Cao in order to support a common method of interacting with software (i.e., through web pages).

23. Regarding claim 88, AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail, Selgas and Cao further show wherein the access mechanism for remotely configuring and reconfiguring the user profile database (AirMobile pgs. 17-21).

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas do not

explicitly show a web-page interface.

Cao shows a web-page interface (Cao, col. 4 lines 8-52, col. 5 lines 62-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas with that of Cao in order to support a common method of interacting with software (i.e., through web pages).

24. Claim 92 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Zondervan (US 6,076,241 B1).

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas show claim 63.

AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas do not show where the data message is a calendar event message.

Zondervan shows where the data message is a calendar event message (col. 7 lines 56-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile in view of Beyda, WyndMail, comp.mail.sendmail and Selgas with that of Zondervan in order to support popular and well-known uses for messaging software/methods (Zondervan col. 6 lines 11 – 67).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. MacIlwain whose telephone number is (571) 272-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Lee, can be reached at (571) 272 - 3967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John MacIlwain

(571) 272 – 9686

/Philip C Lee/
Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442